



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ISRAEL AMONG THE NATIONS.

BY MAX NORDAU.

I.

IF the eyes be not purposely closed to facts, it cannot be denied that, at the close of the nineteenth century, there is in every land of the civilized world a "problem of the Jew." It is a question which presents itself in various phases. Its best known and most brutal form is Anti-Semitism. It is an easy matter—and a proper one—to say that this statement is "the disgrace of our times." Such has the noble Emperor Frederick III. called it. But the philosopher cannot rest content with this. He seeks to trace the psychological roots of Anti-Semitism.

The enemies of the Jew have one statement in instant readiness: "The Jews are hated because of their evil qualities." But this statement will not bear criticism. It voices a certain *naïve* self-deception, among those who hate instinctively at first, and then seek for plausible and rational grounds upon which to justify the sentiment to their own conscience.

The effort to find apparently reasonable grounds for antecedent emotions, whose real origin remains obscured to consciousness, is a very common psychological phenomenon. Folklore knows this, and illustrates it by the proverb: "If a dog's to be drowned, he is called mad." The Jews are not hated, because they have evil qualities: evil qualities are sought for in them, because they are hated. Statistics, handled, not by Jews, but by their opponents, demonstrate facts in all countries that favor the Jew, even in countries where the Jew is under the greatest legal restraints, and where he could plead mitigating circumstances, if he developed the vices of the Helot and the Pariah. Criminality is less among them everywhere than it is among their compatriots of other races;

and it would be reduced almost to the vanishing point if it were possible to exclude professional misdemeanor, such as fraudulent bankruptcy and deception, in which they are concerned—since they are predominantly tradesmen—to a larger extent than their percentage to the population would indicate, but to a less extent than their percentage to the trading classes. The worst and most despicable crimes, murder, manslaughter, violation of the sexual code, robbery and burglary are scarcely ever committed by Jews. They have a smaller death rate, a larger number of marriages and a smaller number of divorces than the average. They have a larger representation in High Schools and Normal Schools, where their entrance to such institutions is not restricted (in Russia and Roumania it is restricted, as is known), than corresponds to their relative numerical proportion in a nation, or even in a metropolis. Where is the justification of belief in the existence of evil qualities in a group of inhabitants, who obey more strictly the laws of the state, of hygiene, of morals, and who show a more pronounced desire for higher culture, than the average of the people among whom that group has been formed? Or do “evil qualities” refer to the love of ostentation, with which the wealthy Jew is frequently upbraided? Let it be assumed—though I do not admit—that the Jewish *parvenu* is more importunate and offensive than those of other races; that would be an indication of a lack of culture, of good taste and discretion, such as might possibly justify rejection by an exclusive club, but could never justify the deprivation of essential human and civic rights, vituperation and cruel persecution.

An argument frequently used by the opponents of the Jew is, that Anti-Semitism is as old as the Jewish nation; that, therefore, the Jews themselves must be responsible for a feeling which they have aroused at all times and in all lands. It is, indeed, true that hatred of the Jew has been his constant and tragic companion during the entire continuance of the Diaspora. But the fact proves nothing against the Jew, since every people, in every epoch, has produced a different reason, or rather pretext, for its Anti-Semitism. The old Roman accused the Jews of worshipping an idol with the head of an ass; they were said to be anarchists, enemies of the state and of the race. The Syrians and Hellenists hated them, because they would not worship the gods of Olympus; possibly also because, in the Alexandrian period, they spoke Greek

with dialectic deviations, unmusical and annoying to the Grecian ear. In early mediaeval times, Jews were despised as murderers of God, upon whom rested a hereditary curse. Later, they were persecuted as infidels, as obdurate enemies of the Christian faith; as poisoners of wells. It was said that they butchered Christian infants, to use their blood for ritualistic purposes; that they stole the Host, and pierced the consecrated water with knives to torture it. Not only their religion, but their race was objectionable. A disgusting physical propensity (*foetor Judaicus*) was ascribed to them. To-day they are accused of being usurers, of plundering the people, of feeding on the fat of the land as parasites, of betraying the nations that give them hospitality.

Since the accusations against the Jews differ so materially, they cannot be ascribed to definite evil qualities. Pretexts change, but the hatred remains. Strange, that every charge made against the Jew is also laid against other minorities, when hated and persecuted by majorities. Slaughter of children for purposes of ritual was an accusation brought by the Romans against the early Christians, and by the Chinese of to-day against missionaries and Europeans in general. All arguments used against the Jew by Anti-Semitism are to be heard from the lips of Russians and Frenchmen in reference to German laborers living in those countries, and even from those of certain "City" people in reference to the "foreign clerk." In this we find the clew that leads us to the truth of the matter.

It is one of the original characteristics of man, that he senses as inimical all that differs from him in essence and in habits. It is enough that some one differs from us; we will then find him disagreeable to us, for he disturbs our organized habits and compels us to new efforts of adaptation, which are always burdensome and trying. If those who differ from us are a disappearing minority, we feel under no compulsion to suppress our antipathy, or even to screen it; and absence of restraint favors development. This is the generically human foundation of all enmity of the majority against a minority living in its midst, particularly if there be an element of tradition and other distinguishing traits about the minority. In the case of the Jews, there is added to this a survival of old religious hatred, and of the influence of the superstitious fables of the Middle Ages, in reference to the abuse of the Host and the murder of children for ritualistic purposes.

Antipathy toward a differentiated minority brings it about that the majority always selects this minority as a scapegoat for all its own faults and mishaps. For it is another psychological law, that children, savages and those in civilized life who are devoid of judgment, hold as responsible for their sufferings, such creatures and objects as have aroused a sense of resentment in them. For this reason, the Jews were accused of poisoning wells during the prevalence of the Black Death; to-day agrarians maintain that the Jews force down the prices of grain; the laboring classes complain that the Jews destroy the opportunities of individual labor; the reactionists in European monarchies insist that the Jews are preparing for a revolution, and that they are organizing opposition to the government. Where there are no Jews, such social phenomena as cause suffering to one or more classes of people are attributed to other groups which are hated; mostly to foreign, though occasionally to native, minorities, either sects or societies: as in France to Protestants and Free Masons, elsewhere to Jesuits, and so on. It is simply the anthropomorphism of displeasure. It proves nothing against the accused. It proves merely that their accusers hated them when suffering began, and that they were seeking for a scapegoat.

Anti-Semitism is not the whole problem of the Jew. It is only one part of it. The other part is the conception which the Jews themselves entertain in regard to their position among the nations, and to the future of Judaism.

It is natural that all Jews suffering under Anti-Semitism should desire to avoid it. The small number of wealthy Jews, who come into no personal contact with the sentiment—for, in point of fact, Anti-Semitism comes to a halt before the palace of the Jewish millionaire, even in Russia, Roumania and Galicia—represent a smiling optimism. This class of Jews are frequently heard to say: "Anti-Semitism is an unpleasant fad and will pass away rapidly, as do all fads." The mass of Jews, however, feel that this is false. Doubtless the mass have not yet recognized the matter clearly, along the line of the present explanation. But it has an instinctive and infallible premonition, that the root of Anti-Semitism is the natural antipathy of all men—even of all animals—against everything that differs from them; and that, consequently, Anti-Semitism will not cease, so long as the Jew is a readily recognizable minority among all nations.

In order to suffer hatred and persecution no longer, in order to attain to normal conditions of life, the Jews must either cease being a minority, or they must cease being distinguishable. This alternative includes the **two solutions** of Judaism, for which the Jews themselves are striving.

On the one hand, there are those who desire to have the Jews constitute the popular majority in some one place. For historic and religious reasons they wish to make Palestine, the land of their fathers, that place. These are the Zionists. If Palestine were again peopled by Jews; if they could hold that land practically by and for themselves (and the present census of Palestine enumerates 600,000 inhabitants, this number including only 60,000 Jews, while there are more than 6,000,000 Jews in the world, who would instantly return to Palestine if that were made possible); then would they suffer no more from Anti-Semitism, they could develop there and enjoy life, as do other nations. And the Jews who do not return to Palestine would have to blame themselves, if they felt the sting of Anti-Semitism in the land of their sojourning; for they would have chosen their lot voluntarily, and could avoid painful situations by joining the great majority of their own race.

Other Jews prefer the second solution. They have no desire to become a distinctive nation on their own soil. They prefer to remain a small minority among their countrymen, but an indistinguishable minority. They are the Assimilationists, who consider the salvation of the Jew coincident with his disappearance among the nations. But few of these realize their position thoroughly, nor have they the moral courage to follow the thought to its logical conclusion. He who wishes to be thoroughly assimilated cannot stop half-way. He must suppress all differences that hold between himself and the popular majority. First and chief among these is religion. He must be baptized, and join one of the Christian denominations. He must purposely surrender the thought of racial inter-marriage, and mingle his blood with that of the people by marriage outside of tribal affinity. Then he can, indeed, cherish the hope that, after three or four generations, his Jewish origin will have been forgotten, and that his descendants will no longer suffer persecution at the hands of Anti-Semitism. If he does less, it will not suffice. It is impossible to remain a Jew and be spared the sense of the "Differentiated Minority."

Nothing is gained by half-way concessions; by celebrating the Sabbath on the Christian Sunday; by excluding the Hebrew language from the Synagogue. By this means an imperfect minority is attained, which fails to make the Jew indistinguishable, but succeeds in making him grotesque. Incomplete assimilation does not change the psychological origin of Anti-Semitism, the antipathy of every majority toward any minority, dwelling in its midst, differentiated and readily recognizable.

II.

The contributions of the Jew to science and art have been repeatedly enumerated, most recently by M. Leroy-Beaulieu (*"Israel parmi les Nations"*). His contributions to the political life of civilized nations have scarcely been recognized. Here and there, possibly, reference is made to him in this connection, but it is always tinged by hatred of the Jew. The German Anti-Semite, Paul Delagarde (*"Deutsche Schriften"*) detected in the franchise of the Jewish voter, even, a dread danger to the organic evolution of German politics. Eduard von Hartmann, author of the *"Philosophie des Unbewussten,"* a work whose brilliant rhetoric secured for it an undeserved renown, maintained (*"Des Judenthum in Gegenwart und Zukunft"*) that all Jews, without exception, belong to the Liberal party, and he concluded from this, that Jews take part in politics, not in the interest of their native land, but exclusively in the interest of their race, which could, of course, look for more powerful support to irreligious and non-historic Liberalism, than to Christian, patriotic Conversatism, rooted in the past history of the nation.

I will not stop to consider the absurdity of the objection, that all Jews are Liberal. It would be equivalent to the reproach, "All Jews strive to secure school-education," or "All Jews avoid drunkenness." But the statement of Eduard von Hartmann is actually false. It is a matter of regret that the Jews do not deserve his reproach, which would in reality be the greatest compliment that could be paid them. The majority of wealthy Jews are not Liberal, but Conservative, and partly even reactionary; and Eduard von Hartmann knows full well that the two baptized Jews, Leo and Stahl, furnished the ultra-Conservative feudal party of Prussia all the historical, philosophical and political thoughts and arguments upon which that party has lived for the

past half century, and upon which it lives to-day. In the same way, it was the baptized Jew, Disraeli, who renewed the programme of the Tories in England, and secured for that Conservative party a new lease of life.

The truth is, that the Jews—with a single exception, which I will presently consider—are nowhere active in Jewish politics. In no country where the Jews enjoy political rights, is there a Jewish vote, in the sense in which the United States has a German or an Irish vote. The Jews who exercise their voting privileges belong entirely to the second category, of which I have spoken above, that is, to those who do not wish to be recognized as a distinctive group of the population. They therefore avoid anxiously everything that might call attention to their Judaism. They do not organize; they create no Jewish election committees; they seek to gain no control in campaigns. More than that. Whenever an election is actually in their own hands, they prefer to nominate a Christian, and only occasionally do they seek, in a shame-faced way, to obtain the concession from the party for which they vote, that a Jewish candidate be nominated in a non-Jewish precinct. The East End of London is the only example of which I know, where a Jewish majority has the courage to send a Jew to the House of Commons in a systematic fashion. It frequently happens, on the Continent, that Jews vote openly for pronounced Anti-Semites.

By this cowardice they propose to show, how completely they have laid aside Judaism, and how fundamentally non-Jewish they feel. For, beyond the point of Anti-Semitism, a Jew cannot well carry his effort for assimilation with anti-Jewish people. During the general elections in France in 1898, many Jews voted for the most desperate Nationalists and Anti-Semites, and the Jew, Klotz, permitted himself to be elected a delegate on a platform which contained the express provision, that a revision of the Dreyfus case should be opposed. In Berlin the Jews could carry several voting precincts, if they would organize; but they have never even presented a Jewish candidate. The Socialists, who are as yet no Anti-Semites, did indeed elect the Jew Singer, but among those who voted for him, scarcely one-tenth were Jews; and he was nominated, not as a Jew by Jews, but as a Socialist, despite his Judaism, by Christian Socialists. In Galicia, the Jews constitute one-ninth of the

inhabitants, or, more exactly, twelve per cent. But their share in the representation of the country is 2.8 per cent., less than one-quarter the percentage due them. In Algiers alone there is something resembling a Jewish vote, but it has proven a misfortune residing there. The "*Décret Crémieux*" in 1870 granted the Algerian Jew the rights of a French citizen, including the civic franchise. But these Jews had not as yet come into full contact with European culture, and were quite unprepared for the exercise of political rights. They followed their communal directors (*Gemeinde Vorsteher*) blindly, and these handled their ignorant co-religionists as voting-cattle, driving cynical bargains with them openly. They auctioned off their dependents to the highest bidder among the candidates, and the Jews voted to a man for their purchaser, to whom they had been sold at five and ten francs a head. The parties that were beaten by the Jewish votes became blood-thirsty Anti-Semites, and brought about the present unpleasant conditions, which will presumably result in the repeal of the "*Décret Crémieux*." In this solitary instance the Jews made use of a suddenly acquired, unaccustomed political right in dense ignorance, and according to the vile *dicta* of a few leaders, who abused their blind faith and made despicable returns for it. The few leaders reaped the profit; the Jews were seriously injured.

Whenever, therefore, the Jews have possessed political rights, they have never, as voters, placed those rights at the disposal of specific Jewish interests, but rather have they frequently served the interests of open enemies of the Jews, thinking that such lack of manhood, such cowardice, would furnish overwhelming evidence of a non-partisan sentiment.

Even less than Jewish voters, have Jewish electors ever furthered specifically Jewish politics. The only exception is that furnished by a group of members of the English Parliament, which forms the nucleus of the Anglo-Jewish Association. For years, these men have used their privileged position in the first Parliament of the world, and their personal influence with the government of their country, to interest their Christian compatriots in the sufferings of Jews in foreign lands, and in appealing to the British Lion for the protection of their persecuted brethren. These English representatives of the Jewish race have grown manly, frank and magnanimous, evidently by reason of their Anglo-Saxon training and the example of their Christian

environment, and can be held up as an example for imitation to the Continental cowards, who grow pale at the thought that their Judaism might be noticed. Of course, the good results which could be obtained by the Anglo-Jewish Association for the persecuted Jews have been limited. They could aid their co-religionists by means of the influence of the British government in the smallest and weakest countries only, and they avoided, with laudable discretion, any solicitation for the aid of English diplomacy in cases where an intervention on the part of England would bring that country into conflict with a powerful opponent. For the Jews of Russia, Roumania, Galicia and Algiers, this sentiment of solidarity on the part of the brave Anglo-Jewish members of Parliament could do nothing; and even for those in Persia and Morocco it could do little. But the cultural merit of their efforts, though practically without result, is in nowise diminished.

In Continental parliaments, during the past twenty years, one has never—I say, never—seen Jewish delegates or senators labor for the Jews of their own country, much less for those of foreign countries. And yet, there have nowhere been lacking excited debates on Jewish matters, in which Jewish parliamentarians could have rightly and properly spoken a word for their race. In the German Reichstag and in the Prussian Landtag, the Christians Rickert, Haehnel, Traeger, Barth, occasionally also Richter and Pachnicke, and even Dr. Lieber, have opposed the Anti-Semitists; but the lips of the Jews and of the baptized Jews have been sealed. In the debates of the French Chamber on the Dreyfus affair, the names of the Jews, Raynal, Naquet, Klotz and Crémieux, are not in evidence. There is no lack of Jews in the Hungarian Parliament. They were silent when the Chamber of Deputies in Pesth re-echoed with monstrous charges connected with an alleged ritualistic murder in Tisza-Eszlar. The same phenomenon recurs in Vienna, where never a word is heard from the Jewish deputies, when Jews in Galicia and Bohemia are robbed, wounded and murdered, and when their colleagues Lueger, Schneider, Gregorig and others utter such statements as these: “Jews are not human beings, they are cattle,” “Government should pay a premium for every Jew shot,” “Jews are beyond the pale of law, humanity and honor.”

But the Jewish politician is invisible and unheard in connection with Jewish questions only. In all other matters he seeks

to play the first violin, and frequently with success. Such a thing as an utterly obscure parliamentarian does not exist, possibly because considerable genius is requisite on their part to obtain a seat in Parliament despite their Judaism. At any rate, it is a fact that, whenever their scientific assimilatory cowardice does not impair their powers, Jews develop no inconsiderable skill. They are skillful and powerful orators in countries like Germany, where oratory is not a munificently scattered talent. They have a sense of duty and a gift of exactness. They are hard workers, even in a human environment wherein, as among certain Latin races, superficiality displaces thoroughness. They are dexterous lobbyists, and usually of a conciliatory, well-meaning nature, ready to serve as intermediators, where interests clash. They always attract attention; quite frequently they are recognized authorities; in some cases they occupy influential positions as leaders.

Let me call attention briefly to the career of a few well-known Jewish politicians. If I cite no American illustrations, it is because they are more familiar to my readers than they are to me. Yet I may be permitted to mention Mr. Straus, who occupies a prominent position among American diplomats, and whom the confidence of the President and Senate of the United States has entrusted with one of the most difficult diplomatic offices in the world, that of minister (and possibly, at an early date, of ambassador) to Constantinople, where he has already achieved several brilliant successes for his country.

Of Disraeli everything has been said that can be said. I wish merely to add that the lustre of his name is constantly growing. The voices which have stigmatized him as adventurer and charlatan have been silenced. Sober criticism recognizes that what has been called his "Oriental imagination" was actually an almost prophetic depth of penetration, and that he foresaw the development of the colonial policy of all the Powers twenty years in advance of his most sharp-sighted contemporaries. Baron Henry Worms received his peerage for services rendered his party and his country. Lord Herschell will be immortalized in the history of the Liberal party of England. Sir Drummond Wolff has the preference of election when England is called upon to solve some peculiarly difficult diplomatic problem. Sir Julian Vogel, late ex-Premier of New Zealand, brought a deteriorated, impoverished colony from the verge of bankruptcy to cultural and

financial prosperity. With a boldness that made men hold their breath, in spite of enmity and calumny, he floated heavy loans, and the result justified his anticipations. He handled millions almost without control, and died a poor man. "*Altesse, saluez!*" Don Ruy Gomez cried in Victor Hugo's "*Hernani*" after the description of a similar character.

In Germany, Jews have played an astonishingly prominent part in political life, in spite of particularly unfavorable conditions, in the midst of a chronic, sometimes latent, but frequently brutally open, Anti-Semitism. Johann Jacobi in his pamphlet "*Vier Fragen eines Ost-Preussen*" (1840), gave the first impulse to a movement, which in eight years culminated in the first constitution of Prussia. The first German Parliament, in the Church of St. Paul in Frankfurt, which consisted of such men as Uhland, Arndt, Jahn, of the greatest poets, students, and statesmen of the German people, knew of none more worthy of its presidency than the baptized Jew, Eduard Simson. The same assembly, the most brilliant, and spiritually the most prominent, Germany has ever witnessed, elected the Jew Gabriel Riesser, Vice-President; Simon as a member of the Committee of Thirty, etc. The same Eduard Simson, whom Bismarck called "a president by birth," was the leader of the deputation which the North-German Reichstag in 1871 sent to King Wilhelm to Versailles to extend to him its congratulations on the establishment of the new German Empire. Eduard Lasker played the most important part in the framing of the Constitution for the German Empire. Bismarck, to whom he had rendered valuable parliamentary services, rewarded him with black ingratitude; but Congress at Washington recognized his merits in a memorable message to the German people. Ludwig Bamberger created a gold standard for Germany, and was for twenty years considered the best speaker of the Reichstag.

In France (1848) the Jew, Goudchaux, held the portfolio of finance, when the four per cent. *rentes* stood at 34 and the three per cents at 33.75, and thus saved the country from impending bankruptcy. Fould secured happy financial conditions for Napoleon III. under unfavorable circumstances. Jules Simon, son of a Jew of Lorraine, Simon Susse, and a mother from Bretagne, was one of the five heroic defenders of liberty during the Second Empire, and a successful President of the Ministry, until discharged by McMahon, after the celebrated "16th of May" (1877), with the

informality of a gross barbarian. M. Raynal, as minister, framed the treaties with the great Railway Association, which were, indeed, sharply criticised by some, but were praised by others as the salvation of French finances. M. Naquet gave to France its divorce laws, and was the leading thinker of Boulangism. He may be reproached with his participation in this despicable movement; he played the most prominent part in it, nevertheless.

I have no desire to be prolix in enumeration. I set aside men of second rank and of mere local celebrity, such as Signor Luzzatti, the successful negotiator of the Franco-Italian commercial treaty, or Dr. Adolph Fishof, the Austrian Minister of the Revolution in 1848, who discovered the only saving formula for a Federal Constitution for Austria. Let it serve as a reminder, merely, that the Jews, Marx and Lasalle, stood sponsors to one of the most important political movements of the day, Socialism; that one of the three leaders of German Social Democracy is the Jew, Singer; that the Jews, Dr. Adler and Dr. Ellenbogen, organized the Socialist party in Austria, and that Russian Nihilism numbers among its leaders, apostles, heroes and martyrs, a large contingent of Jews.

Though the course followed by one or the other of these Jews may meet with disfavor or with contempt, on the part of some, it must be admitted, nevertheless, that they had the strength and the resolution to co-operate in the shaping of the political destiny of their fatherland.

Whenever Jews have secured their political rights, they have rapidly advanced to the front rank of parliamentarians, party leaders, and ministers. Where they are deprived of these rights, they serve as a leaven that arouses clogged masses into liberal, and sometimes into revolutionary, ferment. Political life in any land gains an active and useful element, when Jews are permitted to participate. The Jewish race derives no advantages from Jewish politicians, for these early degenerate into partial or complete renegades, but their native land acquires in them its most faithful and earnest servants.

The more external characteristics which qualify Jews for a political career, their gift of oratory, their endurance, their quick perceptions and diplomatic shrewdness, I have already mentioned. But there are more deeply rooted, nobler qualifications, of a spiritual and moral order, which explain and justify their success

in politics. Their psychologic organization shows a happy mingling of realism and idealism, not frequently found in other races. They possess an acute sense of realization, which guides them to swift orientation in a problem, and suggests a ready solution. But, at the same time, they are gifted with an ancient heritage of idealism, an instinctive longing for higher possibilities of life, for progress, for moral advancement, an unconquerable preference for active participation in the eternal evolvement of Humanity, that makes it impossible for them to sink away utterly into political ambition, election intrigues, clamor for office or demagogic deception of the people. Even the most thoroughly assimilated Jew, who has broken away from all the traditions of his race, and who shares an absolute disgust of all things Jewish, unconsciously cherishes a sacred remnant of the enthusiasm of his ancestors for justice and brotherhood; of their admiration for all labor that savors of mentality; of their hatred of self-seeking and violence.

To one sentiment must I here give voice, which will appear as a paradox to many, because it departs from traditional conception. But it is an opinion based upon unprejudiced investigation of facts, both past and present. The Jew is commonly credited with an unusual faculty for trade. I think this is a total misconception. His natural talents tend to politics. Whenever he is free to act in public affairs, he readily advances to the front rank of parliamentarians, statesmen and diplomats; and the community derives its largest advantages from such fruitful use of his native gifts. Trade to him is merely a "*pis aller*." True, most Jews today still carry on trade, and in some countries commerce is almost entirely in Jewish hands. But it is known that the Jews turned to this vocation, in the first place, not from inclination, but from bitter necessity, simply because it was the only one left open to them by their cruel oppressors in the Middle Ages, and in some great countries it is the only one left open to them to this day.

So long as they lived as an independent people in their own land, they were farmers, shepherds, warriors and priests. The example of their nearest neighbors, the Phœnicians, exerted not the slightest influence upon them. They despised commerce and envied not their sea-faring neighbors the riches they thereby acquired. No act of Jesus Christ is more thoroughly Jewish than the wrath with which he drives the merchants from the Temple. After their dispersion, the Jews were compelled to deny all their

original instincts and adopt a nature foreign to them. They were told to "barter or starve," and of course they preferred trade to starvation. Their faculty of adaptation stood them in good stead in this, and assured them success in a vocation unwillingly assumed. But they are not heart and soul immersed in trade. Two facts demonstrate this. First: The sons of Jewish merchants, who have grown wealthy, have but one ambition, to forsake the vocation of their fathers, and to choose a different career, for the most part, one much more difficult, requiring greater exertion and self-denial and making smaller material returns. Secondly: During the fifteen centuries wherein they have devoted themselves exclusively to trade, they have not produced a single new and fruitful commercial idea, and no one great item of material progress is coupled with a Jewish name.

The draft and the check were the discovery of the mediæval Lombards and Genoese. Double-entry book-keeping is a thought emanating from and developed by Italian Christians. Insurance associations originated in England. Neither Gresham nor the Lloyds were Jews. Englishmen and Frenchmen devised stock companies, and the first use and the first abuse of these enterprises was fostered by Christians. I believe that not a single Jewish name will be found in the first lists of the Dutch East India Company, of the Hudson's Bay Company, of the East India Company, or among the schemes of Law. The first steamship lines, the first railways were planned and built by Christians. The Christian, Cyrus Field, laid the first ocean cable. To-day we stand before a new gigantic industrial revolution, which sets large masses of capital in motion—the introduction of electricity as a source of power. The originators of this movement are the Christians, Siemens and Halske. Mr. Cecil Rhodes is no Jew, and, so far as I know, no Jew takes any important part in the Niger and Borneo Company. The great American railways have been built by the Christians Vanderbilt, Villard and others. The creators of the modern giant, the department-store, Boucicault, Jaluzot, Wanamaker, Hertzog, are not Jews. Neither is Mr. Rockefeller a Jew. I do not know how many Jews are included among the celebrated "Four Hundred" of New York—doubtless a disappearingly small number. Seek for Jews in legitimate and in piratical corporate enterprises, in the great Steamship lines, in the Trusts, in the trans-oceanic commercial ventures of London, Hamburg and

Marseilles, and in the Charter Companies, and they will be found mostly in the second and third ranks, and in some not at all. M. Pereire of the *Compagnie Generale Transatlantique* and Mr. Ballien, of the Hamburg-American Steamship Company, are, to my knowledge, the only Jews at the head of great mercantile fleets.

If by commerce we mean anything beyond the sale of a sugar-loaf in a store; if we mean by it the consolidation of capital produced by labor, and its employment in the realization of great industrial conceptions, in the opening out of new countries, in the application of mechanism to the world's commervial exchanges; it will be recognized that the Jews always follow, that they never lead. With possibly the exception of the South African gold mine district and the petroleum lands of Baku, they are nowhere the first in the field. Even the Rothschilds had no creative thought when they built the *Chemin de Fer du Nord* in France, or the Ferdinand-Northern railway in Austria. The same is true of Baron de Hirsch, the originator of Oriental railways, and of the unfortunate Strousberg, who planned the Roumanian railroads. All this is imitation; there is no bold initiative about it. This lack of originality certainly does not bespeak commercial talent in a people whose occupation, handed down from father to son, is trade. Had they the native commercial instincts, where-with prejudice credits them, and did not trade in reality antagonize the inmost genius of the race, it would surely, within the past fifteen hundred years, have produced some few commercial originators and creators, such as it has produced in the domain of poetry, art, philosophy and science.

III.

It is impossible to treat a vast and intricate phenomenon, such as the Jewish problem, exhaustively in a Review article. I desired to elucidate only a few of the many aspects of this question, and I draw the following conclusions from what has been adduced.

Even well-meaning Christian observers of Jews admit the one point only, that the Jews serve the people among whom they live in a commercial capacity solely. But this is not a correct perception of their nature. It is just in commerce that they could be best spared and most easily replaced, at least among the civilized people of the Occident, and they will presumably, of their own volition, leave trade and turn to other vocations more in accord

with their genius after they have lived in freedom and equal rights for a few more generations.

Where the Jews have attained equal rights, they are still haunted by the fears of Ghetto times; they have not yet a sense of quiet and assured possession, but are pursued by the secret dread that they will be again deprived of what has been given them. They are possessed by an almost morbid desire to demonstrate to their Christian compatriots that they are citizens of the country simply, and nothing but that. Their patriotism is more sensitive and demonstrative than that of Christians. They noisily repudiate any solidarity with Jews of other lands. They affect an unnatural indifference toward all Jewish interests, an indifference never met with among Christians. They strive to make their Judaism as unobtrusive as possible, and frequently persuade themselves that they are not a distinctive race, still less a distinctive people, nor that they have had antecedent and historic origins differing from those of their Christian compatriots. Oddly enough, however, only a minority is sufficiently logical to do that which comports with such sentiments, that is, to be baptized, and to give their descendants a Christian ancestry by marriage with Christians. From this the conclusion follows, that the Assimilationists are subject to a passing nervousness only, and that, at bottom, they have not entirely overcome Jewish nature, and that they will again awaken to race-consciousness when emancipation has ceased to be a novelty.

The Jews, who do not possess equal rights—and these comprise four-fifths of the race—have preserved the consciousness that they are a distinctive people. They realize that they can escape the hatred that pursues them only by ceasing to be a recognizable minority in the midst of other peoples. They refuse to sink their identity. Lost identity is no solution of the Jewish problem. They look for their salvation in a re-union in a land which shall be their own, where they will be the majority, and where they can develop in a temperature of sympathy along their own organic lines.

MAX NORDAU.